

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Yuba)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SHANNON MARIE SILVA,

Defendant and Appellant.

C086935

(Super. Ct. No. CRF17-1610)

Appointed counsel for defendant Shannon Marie Silva has filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) We will affirm the judgment.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124.)

In August 2017, defendant broke into a house. A few days later, items taken from the house were found in defendant's possession.

In February 2018, defendant pleaded no contest to first degree burglary. (Pen. Code, § 459.) In April 2018, the trial court sentenced defendant to six years in state prison. The court imposed an \$1,800 restitution fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (b)), a corresponding \$1,800 parole revocation fine, suspended unless parole is revoked (Pen. Code, § 1202.45), a \$40 court security fee (Pen. Code, § 1465.8), and a \$30 conviction assessment fee (Gov. Code, § 70373). The trial court awarded zero days of custody credit.

Defendant timely appealed and did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

### **DISCUSSION**

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel advised defendant of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days have elapsed, and we have received no such communication from defendant.

We have undertaken an examination of the entire record and find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

### **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Blease, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Raye, P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Butz, J.